DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 241 749 CE 038 538

AUTHOR Sheppard, N. Alan
TITLE A Policy Analysis of Professional Development and Personnel Preparation for Serving Special Populations. Information Series No. 279.
INSTITUTION Ohio State Univ., Columbus. National Center for Research in Vocational Education.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Vocational and Adult Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE 84
CONTRACT 300-83-0016
NOTE 47p.; For related documents, see CE 038 535-539 and CE 038 557.
AVAILABLE FROM National Center Publications, National Center for Research in Vocational Education, 1960 Kenny Road, Columbus, OH 43210 (IN279--$4.25).
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Disabilities; Educational Improvement; *Educational Needs; Educational Policy; *Exceptional Persons; Federal Legislation; Mainstreaming; Minority Groups; National Programs; *Policy Formation; Professional Development; *Program Improvement; Secondary Education; *Teacher Education; Teacher Qualifications; *Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS United States

ABSTRACT

This country has few highly qualified personnel to fulfill the various state commitments to legislation mandating effective vocational programs for two special populations, i.e., persons discriminated against on the basis of racial/ethnic identity and the physically handicapped. The result of a lack of national policy in this area has been a leadership void, and the efforts that have been made in personnel preparation and professional development have been piecemeal and token. Ten alternative solutions to the problem have been proposed and analyzed. Based on the comparisons of advantages and disadvantages, the policy alternatives determined to be the most effective for improving personnel preparation are the following: (1) the U.S. Department of Education should mandate statewide comprehensive programs of personnel development, including a system for preservice, graduate, and inservice activities for teachers and administrators who work with minority and handicapped students; (2) a fixed percentage of each state's basic grant should be designed for professional development and personnel preparation; (3) the Congress and U.S. Department of Education should make grants through state agencies to provide opportunities to update the competencies of vocational education personnel who serve special populations; and (4) the Congress and U.S. Department of Education should reestablish the Leadership Development Program to train administrators and to retrain personnel from other fields to work with special populations in vocational education. (KC)

ED241749

Information Series No. 279

A POLICY ANALYSIS OF PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND PERSONNEL PREPARATION FOR SERVING SPECIAL POPULATIONS

N. Alan Sheppard
Morgan State University

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

The National Center for Research in Vocational Education
The Ohio State University
1960 Kenny Road
Columbus, Ohio 43210

1984

CE 038538

FUNDING INFORMATION

Project Title:	National Center for Research in Vocational Education, Applied Research and Development
Contract Number:	300830016
Project Number:	051MH30001
Act Under Which Funds Administered:	Education Amendments of 1976, P.L. 94-482
Source of Contract:	Office of Vocational and Adult Education U.S. Department of Education Washington, D.C. 20202
Contractor:	The National Center for Research in Vocational Education The Ohio State University Columbus, Ohio 43210
Executive Director:	Robert E. Taylor
Disclaimer:	This publication was prepared pursuant to a contract with the Office of Vocational and Adult Education, U.S. Department of Education. Contractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgment in professional and technical matters. Points of view or opinions do not, therefore, necessarily represent official U.S. Department of Education position or policy.
Discrimination Prohibited:	Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 states: "No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance." Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 states: "No person in the United States shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, or be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any education program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance." Therefore, the National Center for Research in Vocational Education Project, like every program or activity receiving financial assistance from the U.S. Department of Education, must be operated in compliance with these laws.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF TABLES v

FOREWORD vii

PREFACE ix

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY xi

CHAPTER 1. BACKGROUND OF THE PROBLEM 1

- Introduction 1
- Goals and Objectives 1
- Overview of Handicapped and Minority Students 1
- Personnel Development in Vocational Education: Meaning and Problems 5
- Prior Efforts to Resolve the Problem and Assessment of Past Policies 6
- State of the Art in Special Needs Personnel Preparation and Certification 8
- The Influence of Key Leadership Groups 11
- Significance of the Problem 13

CHAPTER 2. THE POLICY PROBLEM 15

- Problem Statement, Assumptions, Definitions, and Client Identification 15

CHAPTER 3. POLICY ALTERNATIVES 19

- Description of Alternatives 10
  - Alternative No. 1 20
  - Alternative No. 2 20
  - Alternative No. 3 23
  - Alternative No. 4 23
  - Alternative No. 5 24
  - Alternative No. 6 24
  - Alternative No. 7 25
  - Alternative No. 8 25
  - Alternative No. 9 26
  - Alternative No. 10 26

Page

CHAPTER 4. POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS 29

Most Effective Alternatives 29
Moderately Effective Alternatives 29
Minimally Effective Alternatives 30
Implementation Strategy 30
Provisions for Monitoring and Evaluation 31
Supplementary Suggestions 32

CHAPTER 5. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS 33

REFERENCES 35

LIST OF TABLES

Page

TABLE 1. HANDICAPPED POPULATION SERVED IN VOCATIONAL EDUCATION AND SPECIAL EDUCATION, BY HANDICAP 3

TABLE 2. ENROLLMENT OF MINORITIES IN VOCATIONAL EDUCATION 4

TABLE 3. AVERAGE INCOME FOR YEAR-ROUND FULL-TIME WORKERS 4

TABLE 4. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN POLICY ALTERNATIVES AND CRITERIA FOR SELECTION 21

FOREWORD

Vocational education programs in the United States serve a diverse clientele with a multitude of programs in complex and diverse settings. The diversity and complexity of these settings contribute, in fact, to the federal policymaker's dilemma: how to formulate federal educational policy that is relevant in all settings.

Policy analysis, too, is complex and multiopinionated. This dual complexity of programs and policy analysis presents special problems for developers of policy options. The policy analysts role is seldom simple, but the search for policy alternatives that are meaningful and useable is an essential undertaking if vocational education is to move forward.

Federal policymakers are the primary audience for this policy paper. However, state and local policymakers should find the presentation of policy options and the discussion of their advantages and disadvantages to be useful.

The National Center expresses its appreciation to N. Alan Sheppard, the policy paper author. Dr. Sheppard is Dean of Education at Morgan State University. Prior to being named Dean at Morgan State University, he was Associate Professor in the College of Education at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. From 1977 to 1980, Dr. Sheppard was Staff Director and Special Assistant for the Federal Council on the Aging.

In addition, the National Center expresses it appreciation to the following individuals who reviewed Dr. Sheppard's policy paper: Dr. Willis D. Hawley, Vanderbilt University; Dr. Gary Meers, University of Nebraska; and Dr. Michelle Sarkees, University of Georgia.

Valuable assistance in selecting the policy paper authors was provided by Dr. Don Gentry, Indiana State Director of Vocational Education; Wilburn Pratt, Kentucky State Director of Vocational Education; Dr. Beryl Radin, University of Southern California; and National Center staff members Dr. Morgan Lewis, Dr. Wesley Budke, Dr. Juliet Miller, Dr. Susan Imel, and Dr. Linda Lotto. Dr. William Dunn, University of Pittsburgh, conducted an informative policy analysis seminar for the paper authors. Additionally, National Center staff worked with the authors in identifying relevant literature.

The National Center is indebted to the staff members who worked on the study. The study was conducted in the Information Systems Division, Dr. Joel Magisos, Associate Director. Dr. Floyd L. McKinney, Senior Research Specialist, served as Project Director and Alan Kohan as Graduate Research Associate. Dr. McKinney, a former secondary vocational education teacher, holds a Ph.D. in vocational education from Michigan State University. He has served as a university coordinator of graduate vocational education programs and as a division director in a state department of education. Mr. Kohan is a doctoral candidate in compreshensive vocational education at The Ohio State University and has a M.Ed. in Curriculum and Instruction from the University of Hawaii. Patsy Slone served as secretary for the project. Joan Blank and Roxi Liming provided technical

editing and final editorial review of the paper was provided by Constance Faddis of the National Center's Editorial Services area.

Robert E. Taylor
Executive Director
The National Center for Research
in Vocational Education

PREFACE

Federal policymakers need to be aware of alternative policy options before they can make decisions regarding the optimal resolution of critical problems in vocational education. By utilizing the expertize of vocational educators, the policy options should provide policymakers with information regarding anticipated impacts, advantages, and disadvantages of each alternative.

Recognizing this need of federal policymakers, the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE), requested that the National Center for Research in Vocational Education conduct a study for the purpose of preparing policy analysis papers in eight priority areas of high national interest. The areas identified by OVAE were (1) private sector involvement with the vocational community, (2) entrepreneurship, (3) defense preparedness, (4) high technology, (5) youth employment, (6) special needs of special populations, (7) excellence in education, and (8) educational technology.

In accordance with the instructions received from the Office of Vocational and Adult Education, The National Center for Research in Vocational Education conducted a limited competitive search for authors to develop policy analysis papers on the eight critical issues in vocational education. Vocational education faculty members from educational professional development (EPD) institutions of higher education entered the competition by submitting a five-page proposal. No proposals were received on the topic of defense preparedness. After an extensive internal and external review process, eight authors were approved by the Assistant Secretary for Vocational Education, U.S. Department of Education.

The authors were provided assistance in policy analysis procedures, identification of relevant literature, and feedback on draft papers by policy analysts and educators. The authors presented their papers at a seminar in Washington, D.C., for key federal vocational education policymakers.

Other policy papers produced in this series are these:

- George H. Copa, University of Minnesota
  Vocational Education and Youth Employment
- Andrew A. Helwig, East Texas State University
  Alternative Training Options For Structurally Unemployed Older Workers
- Dennis R. Herschbach, University of Maryland
  Addressing Vocational Training and Retraining Through Educational Technology: Policy Alternatives
- Ruth P. Hughes, Iowa State University
  Secondary Vocational Education: Imperative for Excellence

- Clyde F. Maurice, The Florida State University
  Private Sector Involvement with the Vocational Community: An Analysis of Policy Options

- L. Allen Phelps University of Illinois
  An Analysis of Fiscal Policy Aiternatives for Serving Special Populations in Vocational Education

- Gordon I. Swanson, University of Minnesota
  Excellence in Vocational Education: A Research Perspective

Floyd L. McKinney
Project Director and
Senior Research Specialist

Alan Kohan
Graduate Research Associate

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The primary audience for this policy analysis paper is federal policymakers. The secondary audience is state and local level policymakers. This paper provides alternative policy options that contain information about anticipated impacts, advantages, and disadvantages for each alternative. Recommendations for solving the problem are given.

This policy paper has primary implications for two special populations: (1) persons discriminated against on the basis of racial/ethnic identity and (2) the handicapped. The goal of this paper is to improve the professional development and personnel preparation of vocational educators who teach, plan, and/or develop comprehensive vocational education programs for the handicapped and/or for ethnic/racial minority students.

Some major influences over the past decade on personnel development for vocational educators dealing with special populations have included such issues and trends as mainstreaming, career education, and competency-based teacher education. However, at the federal level there appears to be little or no coordination between and/or among leadership groups interested in special needs personnel preparation. The most positive change has been the increase in the number of states that require all teachers to take special education coursework to continue or obtain certification.

Iowa is one notable example of a state that has not only placed the program for special needs directly under the State Commissioner of Education, with vocational and special education staff members, but, it has also stressed the acquisition of multicultural education competencies for state certification. In addition, professional organizations are beginning to emerge as one of the nation's best advocates for professional and personnel preparation programs at the national and state levels.

The problem that this paper addresses is the lack of highly qualified vocational education personnel available for states to fulfill their commitment to and meet the intent of the law for effective vocational programs for special populations. The performance of past policy, or better stated "no policy," has created a leadership void at all levels. Past efforts of professional development and personnel preparation have been piecemeal and token. The situation will not be reverted until there is a federal policy for vocational education personnel development.

Ten alternative solutions to the problem are proposed. Criteria, advantages, and disadvantages for each alternatives are analyzed.

Based upon the comparisons of advantages and disadvantages, the policy alternatives determined to be the most effective for improving personnel preparation to teach students from special populations are:

- The U.S. Department of Education should mandate or require statewide comprehensive programs of personnel development, including a system for preservice, graduate, and

inservice activities. Attention should be given to the developmental needs of teachers, administrators, and specialists, especially as their need for training relates to their competency in working with minority and handicapped students.

- A fixed percentage of each state's basic grant should be designated for professional development and personnel preparation. Provision should be made for a fixed percentage of any funds to be set aside for improvement of personnel preparation for special populations.

- The Congress/U.S. Department of Education should reestablish Section 553 (Part F of the Old EPDA) and make grants through state agencies to provide opportunities to update vocational education personnel competencies by putting the emphasis on special populations through exchange programs with business and industry or other means, and to provide other inservice teacher education and short-term institutes.

- The Congress/U.S. Department of Education should reestablish the Leadership Development Program (Section 552, Part F of EPDA) to train administrators and other instructional leaders and to retrain personnel from other fields to work with special populations in vocational education.

The policy alternatives are, of course, easier to recommend than to implement and regulate. Nevertheless, the U.S. Department of Education, state departments of education, teacher education institutions, and advocacy groups should consider these alternatives as potential solutions for the lack of highly qualified vocational education personnel available to teach, plan, develop, and administer programs for special populations.

CHAPTER 1

BACKGROUND OF THE PROBLEM

Introduction

Providing appropriate vocational and technical education opportunities to special needs populations is a priority in vocational education. The Vocational Education Amendments of 1968 (P.L. 90-576) focused attention on and allocated resources for programs serving the disadvantaged and handicapped. As the commitment to special needs populations has grown, the description and definition of each group has been expanded and clarified. Special needs populations include persons who require special help or services in order to enter, perform successfully in, and complete a regular vocational program. Because of time and resource constraints, this policy analysis is limited to the two special populations specified by the Office of Civil Rights (OCR) Guidelines as being discriminated against in vocational education on the basis of (1) racial/ethnic identity and (2) handicap.

Goal and Objectives

The goal of this policy analysis paper is to improve the professional development and personnel preparation of vocational educators for teaching, planning, and developing comprehensive vocational education programs for handicapped and racial/ethnic minority students. The objectives are as follows:

- Provide a state-of-the-art report on personnel preparation to meet the needs of handicapped and minority students in vocational education
- Make recommendations to the U.S. Department of Education (primary client/stakeholder) and other stakeholders (e.g., the Congress, state departments of education, and teacher education institutions) on alternative policies to improve special needs personnel preparation

Overview of Handicapped and Minority Students

Handicapped Students

Vocational educators have attempted to mainstream most handicapped students, in keeping with the Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 (P.L. 94-142), which provides for free and appropriate education for handicapped individuals (including the development of individualized educational programs). Continued evaluation of vocational education programs, however, shows that handicapped persons are still underserved (General Accounting Office 1976; Hull

1981), underlining the need for increasing the attention given to discovering ways to provide effective vocational training for disabled students. Comprehensive vocational education emphasizes that handicapped students should be the responsibility of regular vocational instructors, with support from special education staff as needed by the students. In order to meet this need, vocational instructors must provide sequential educational instruction and training appropriate to the needs and progress of each handicapped student. Consequently, vocational instructors must not only have the competencies, knowledge, and technical skills needed to be effective in the vocational skill area, but must also possess specific competencies and knowledge needed to teach handicapped students effectively.

Who are the handicapped? Which categories of handicapping conditions are served in vocational programs? Table 1 provides a profile of handicapped students served in both special education and vocational education programs.

As illustrated in the table, slightly over 36 percent of the handicapped persons enrolled in vocational education (in comprehensive high schools and area vocational centers) are mentally retarded, and 37 percent have a specific learning disability. The remaining 27 percent are identified in one of the nine other handicapping categories; of these, 7 percent are orthopedically impaired, 3 percent are visually handicapped, and 4 percent are hard of hearing or deaf. The largest remaining group, 10 percent, is listed as "other health impaired," and 5 percent are multihandicapped.

Minority Students

Minority students comprise about 25 percent of vocational education enrollment (American Vocational Association 1981). Blacks, who comprise 11.6 percent of the American population, make up about 18 percent of those in vocational education; Hispanics, who form 5.6 percent of the population, comprise 6.1 percent of vocational enrollees. Since 1972, the enrollment of minorities in vocational education has increased by approximately 50 percent (see table 2).

There are suggestive parallels between the enrollment patterns of minorities in vocational education and the level of earnings and kinds of occupational identity of minorities in the general population. Blacks and Hispanics are underrepresented in the higher-skilled technical and white-collar occupations and are overrepresented in traditional service occupations (American Vocational Association 1981). The black unemployment rate is consistently higher than that for whites. Annual earnings of blacks and Hispanics are consistently below those of whites (see table 3).

Similarly, minorities are underrepresented in selected vocational education programs and overrepresented in others. Teachers as well as students reflect this skewing, with the largest percentage of black teachers in traditionally female trade and industrial programs and the largest percentage of Hispanic teachers in health programs, a traditionally female (and therefore low-paying) occupation.

Summary of Minority and Handicapped Student Status in Vocational Education

Vocational education is not presently able to provide sufficiently for handicapped and minority students who need special services and training to overcome their problems and become self-sufficient. Many of these students will have traumatic experiences as they seek to enter the labor force unless they can be given adequate vocational preparation. Based on this author's experience

TABLE 1

HANDICAPPED POPULATION SERVED IN VOCATIONAL EDUCATION AND SPECIAL EDUCATION, BY HANDICAP

	Percent of Handicapped Population Served in Special Education [a]	Percent of Handicapped Population Served in Vocational Education [b]
Mentally Retarded	21.8	36.5
Hard of Hearing	1.0	2.6
Deaf	1.0	0.9
Speech Impaired	29.4	2.7
Visually Handicapped	0.8	2.5
Emotionally Disturbed	8.2	7.3
Orthopedically Impaired	1.6	2.4
Learning Disabled	31.7	36.8
Deaf or Blind	0.0	0.2
Multihandicapped	1.5	4.6
Other Health Impaired	2.6	9.9

SOURCE: Conaway (1981, p. 24)

[a] National summary, "State Agency Reports of Handicapped Children Receiving Special Education and Related Services," 1979-1980.

[b] Based on data from the Vocational Education Civil Rights Survey, 1980, Comprehensive High Schools and Area Vocational Centers (preliminary unedited survey data).

TABLE 2

ENROLLMENT OF MINORITIES IN VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Minorities	1972	1977	1978	Percent Increase
American Indian or Alaska Native	83,074	107,999	112,999	36.02
Black, not of Hispanic Origin	1,660,585	2,357,497	2,425,899	46.09
Asian or Pacific Islander	98,962	177,800	199,543	101.64
Hispanic	736,516	1,046,262	1,109,169	50.8

SOURCE: American Vocational Association (1981).

TABLE 3

AVERAGE INCOME FOR YEAR-ROUND FULL-TIME WORKERS (IN DOLLARS)

Worker	Female	Male
Black	9,020	13,239
Hispanic	8,331	11,943
White	12,530	16,360

SOURCE: U.S. Bureau of the Census (1978).

and an examination of the literature (e.g., Hull 1981; Moody & Sheppard 1976; and Proctor 1981) in the area of special populations, the professional preparation of vocational educators is devoid of introduction to working with these students. This negligence can do enormous harm and can contribute to these students' missing countless valuable learning and working opportunities. *Therefore, preparing vocational educators in vocational programming for handicapped and minority students is a central issue in the delivery of vocational education to these special populations.* To this end, the policy focus of this paper is directed toward professional development and personnel preparation for minority and handicapped students.

Personnel Development in Vocational Education: Meaning and Problems

In a prepared statement for the House Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary and Vocational Education, Rupert N. Evans (1980) stated:

> There are three keys to the revitalization of vocational education: (a) professional staff, (b) curriculum and curriculum materials, and (c) facilities and equipment. Most people will agree that improvements are needed in all three, but my testimony is directed at the development of teachers, administrators, guidance counselors, teacher educators, and other staff members. These are the people who make or break vocational education. No matter how good the facilities or the curriculum, little can be accomplished without capable staff (p. 1).

Evans put in the proper perspective the importance of personnel development in vocational education for today as well as tomorrow. This stark reality must be acknowledged, despite substantial personnel development problems (e.g., teacher shortages, those who lack teaching skills, those who lack technical skills, and inadequate state personnel development support systems). Only in this way can the necessary plan of action be installed and implemented to ensure a cadre of competent professionals in vocational education.

By definition, personnel development is the process whereby people are assisted in the improvement of the delivery of services in staff development, preservice, and inservice education. This process includes some *research, curriculum, development,* and *demonstration activities.*

Preservice education is provided through approved public and nonpublic institutions of higher education. Such training includes courses in general, professional, and technical subject matter that meet or exceed the certification requirements for personnel in the various vocational education program fields.

Inservice education is offered by teacher educators, state and local supervisory staff, and special consultants who work both independently and cooperatively. Such education is provided through regular institutional courses; short intensive courses; local and statewide summer workshops; and national, state, area, and local conferences; as well as via school visits.

With the assistance of the Vocational Education Amendments of 1976 (P.L. 94-482), state departments of education have administered and managed the personnel development system for vocational educators in the individual states since 1970. This system has been reasonably effective because it is coordinated, systematically planned, and comprehensively administered. The activities focus on the inservice educational/training needs of vocational education personnel.

Vocational education is a growing and expanding field of education. As more and more individuals enroll in vocational education courses, more emphasis is placed on marketable skills for secondary and postsecondary graduates. As our society becomes more technologically oriented, vocational education also becomes more and more responsible for the "hard to teach" individual. Unquestionably, this is one of the major challenges in preparing vocational education personnel to work effectively with students from special populations.

Prior Efforts to Resolve the Problem and Assessment of Past Policies

Over the past decade, the problems and difficulties that face handicapped and minority persons in their efforts to obtain and maintain employment have been widely documented by researchers, public policy analysts, and advocacy organizations. In the 1970s the U.S. Congress enacted several pieces of education, training, and employment legislation that focused, in part, on resolving these problems. The Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 (P.L. 94-142), along with the Vocational Education Amendments of 1976 (P.L. 94-482), the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1978 (CETA) (P.L. 95-524), and several civil rights initiatives placed a priority upon ensuring that handicapped and minority individuals receive appropriate vocational education programs and services. These various pieces of legislation acknowledged the concurrent need for staff development and teacher education programs to ensure that effective programs and services are delivered. Despite these diverse legislative thrusts the literature is replete with statements suggesting that present teacher training programs do not adequately prepare teachers to work with students from special populations (Grosenick and Huntze 1980; Kienast and Lovelace 1981; Sheppard 1983a; Stainbeck, Stainbeck and Maurer 1976; Van Etten, Arkell, and Van Etten 1980.)

Although the situation is changing, teacher education programs have historically made little or no systematic effort to prepare preservice teachers to teach handicapped and minority students.

This section examines and reports on the literature in the area of personnel development—particularly that literature pertaining to vocational education special needs preparation (i.e., state-of-the-art technical preparation, issues and trends, certification requirements, and the like.) Noted are major outcomes of past efforts that have influenced policy development in this area.

Cited articles attest to the need for improvement in special needs vocational personnel development, and many of these articles single out teachers of handicapped and disadvantaged youth. None, however, are more explicit in describing this need than the General Accounting Office report to the Congress (1976). The following statement from this report underlines the need for improvement in training for teachers of handicapped children:

> The handicapped are usually excluded from the regular public school vocational programs and are limited to segregated classes offering few career choices. One major barrier preventing them from participating in regular vocational programs is that vocational educators generally lack training in dealing with the handicapped. For this reason and because of their apprehension, vocational educators generally exclude the handicapped from the regular vocational programs. This lack of needed training could result in millions of handicapped individuals being unemployed and heavily dependent on society (p. 28).

The Comptroller General (ibid.) also suggested that "to improve career opportunities for the handicapped, vocational educators should receive instruction in how to effectively deal with the handicapped."

The report presented a bleak picture of the consequences to the country of not developing sound vocational programs for handicapped students, and cited the following U.S. Office of Education estimates.

> Without vocational education, many of the millions of handicapped youth leaving school will be unemployed, on welfare, totally dependent on society, or otherwise idle much of the time. With vocational education, however, educators estimate that 75 percent of the physically disabled and 90 percent of the mentally retarded could work, either in the competitive job market or in a sheltered workshop (p. 29).

The General Accounting Office report underscored the need to provide additional training for vocational teachers of the handicapped. It also indicated the extremely high priority that the U.S. Department of Education placed on meeting the need. Specifically, the GAO recommended that the U.S. Office of Education *develop and implement a plan to stimulate a major effort to provide vocational educators with the skills and abilities needed to effectively deal with the handicapped in the regular classroom*. Furthermore, as the U.S. Secretary of Education stated:

> We concur with the findings of the GAO report and firmly acknowledge that the current exclusion of the handicapped from regular vocational education programs is a serious problem which needs attention. The problem is twofold: vocational educators are not being afforded the opportunity to acquire the skills and abilities necessary to work effectively with the handicapped in vocational education and, secondly, special educators are not adequately prepared to provide the appropriate career and prevocational educational experiences to handicapped students. Although there are efforts underway through EHA training funds to train specialists in this area of need, we are proposing that the U.S. Office of Education develop a formal cooperative agreement between the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped and the Bureau of Occupational and Adult education to facilitate this activity. The two bureaus will jointly establish program guidelines aimed at developing joint modes of implementation and evaluation, as well as jointly stressing the high priority of this approach to the training institutions (p. 57).

The department's comment left little doubt regarding the U.S. Secretary's concurrence with the stated need for improving programs of preparation for vocational special needs teachers. The department comment also conveyed the U.S. Secretary's intent to increase efforts to alleviate the problem.

Commenting on vocational education personnel's approach to teaching and understanding minority students, Sheppard (1983a) stated:

> To teach, for example, black students most effectively and implement respect for cultural diversity with the vocational education setting requires more than curricula changes. Many black students bring expectations and orientations to the vocational education class which reflect their cultural conditioning. Frequently these are not consistent with the institutional norms and expectations of the school. The potential, therefore, for conflict to materialize increases considerably when black students and teachers do not share similar ethnic identities, cultural codes, value systems, and background experiences. Differing expectations can be seen in such areas as communication processes,

behavioral patterns and nonverbal nuances. Hence, it is imperative that vocational educators understand the value systems, cultural codes, relational patterns and communication habits of black and other ethnic minority students as a prerequisite to more accurately interpret behavioral patterns and attitudes in the classroom and laboratory (p. 13).

State of the Art in Special Needs Personnel Preparation and Certification

The state of the art in certification of professionals who provide vocational/career education for special populations can best be presented by the work of Benson (1982), who provides an overview of trends in certification requirements. She begins by citing a significant monograph written by Brock (1977). This monograph presents data that clarified the lack of preparation of secondary level personnel who served special needs students. It brings to light the disparity of emphasis between elementary and secondary preparation of special needs personnel. Replication results of the 1977 study are also presented by Brock (1979). As a result of this longitudinal study, the following observations and recommendations were made:

- **Program development is viable and growing, yet slow.** The number of operational programs—programs that specifically train vocational/special needs professionals—increased from 25 percent in 1977 to 36 percent in 1979. These programs go beyond the mandated coursework in special education required of all teachers (in states that have such a requirement). A reported 730 program graduates in 1979 (as opposed to 166 in 1977) demonstrated a more specific growth pattern.

- **Programs that add on a course to existing programs or combine two separate programs are not the best approaches to training personnel.** Training programs designed specifically for personnel who work with special needs students offer the optimal preparation. Such programs contain their own philosophy, program goals, curricula, evaluation system, and teaching methodology, among other aspects of a training program. An ideal program should not be eclectic, in that bits and pieces should not be taken from other training programs (i.e., mental retardation, learning disabilities, emotional disturbance, physical handicaps, or vocational education) and combined to formulate a new training program. An appropriate training program would be one that prepares professionals to offer specialized services to meet the multidimensional needs of special needs students.

- **More precise communication between university training programs and state teacher certification officials should take place.** This would alleviate some of the confusion about "who is offering what" in regard to professional training.

- **University training programs should increase and improve dissemination activities so that more individuals can become knowledgeable about offerings.**

- **The mandated requirement of special education coursework for all certified teachers is best met by designing courses that address adaptations of regular (including vocational) classrooms, teaching techniques, materials, and equipment.**

Brock views the state of the art in preparing vocational and special education personnel to work with special needs students as transition dynamic. In 1979, some individuals were becoming aware of the necessity to provide vocational career education for special needs students, and others were already providing such programs. The field was growing and developing despite contravening political interests and resistance to change that is often imposed upon innovators.

Brock (1979) includes a breakdown of states that required special education coursework for all teachers, offered specialized training for special fields personnel (e.g., vocational education, industrial arts), and were aware of vocational/career-oriented training programs. Data were obtained by direct telephone interviews with forty-eight state certification officials. A replication of the 1977 and 1979 studies was made by Beason in 1981 to investigate possible changes. The responses obtained, when compared with the 1977 and 1979, studies reveal that eight states required some special education preparation of all teachers in 1977, as compared to fourteen in 1979, and twenty-two in 1981.

This increase signifies a definite trend. Obviously, if all teachers are required, for example, to take special education coursework, then secondary-level teachers who work with special needs students should be included. This does not indicate, however, a requirement for specialized coursework for secondary-level personnel. The requirement is for special education coursework that does not differentiate among kindergarten teachers, high school English teachers, or vocational educators.

Brock (1979) also reports that no states (at that time) required additional education coursework for vocational educators and other special field personnel beyond the requirement for all teachers. This finding changed in the 1981 replication, with Minnesota and Pennsylvania interviewees reporting that extra coursework in special education, beyond general requirements, is a requirement for vocational educators and other special field personnel in these states.

Preservice and Inservice Activities Currently Underway at Major Colleges and Universities

Clark and Evans (1976) cite, in a state-of-the-art examination, numerous influences that they believe affect the preparation of vocational and special education personnel for working with special needs students; these influences include professional dissatisfaction, current issues and trends, and leadership groups. One of the leadership groups cited is that of teacher educators, whom this author feels have not found a significant amount of leadership from within their own ranks. Truly cooperative programs involving vocational educators and special educators on an equal footing are also rare. Bowen (1980) corroborates the low level of cooperation between special and vocational education by pointing out that personnel from these fields are traditionally prepared independently. However, Bowen also notes that a number of colleges and universities are increasingly becoming aware of the need to educate personnel to work with special needs students.

The remainder of this subsection highlights past and present preservice and inservice activities at colleges/universities.

Workshops, courses, and university programs are currently being designed to prepare vocational special needs personnel. Funding for these activities tends to come from local support, state departments of education (i.e., for vocational education and special education) a 10 percent set-aside, from P.L. 94-482 and P.L. 94-142, respectively, and the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (specifically, the Training Personnel for the Education of the Handicapped Program).

It should be noted that as early as 1975, this author used funding under the Education Professions Development Act (EPDA) to bring together in Virginia a group of vocational and special education professionals at the state level for a two-day strategy meeting on delivery systems for the handicapped in vocational education. Since that time, universities and colleges, including the University of Illinois and Kent State University, have been very successful in bringing together groups

of vocational and special education professionals to identify tasks personnel involved in the vocational programming of special needs students need to perform. Since that time, the University of Minnesota has developed competency ratings for coordinators of special needs in Minnesota. The University of Wisconsin-Stout conducted an investigation of the teacher competencies needed to utilize diagnostic test data in prescribing occupational learning experiences in teaching the educable mentally retarded.

In 1976, Florida State University conducted an exemplary-based vocational teacher education project with a disadvantaged component. A similar study was also conducted by the Pennsylvania State University in 1978. The project dealt with identifying pedagogical competencies needed to train vocational education teachers to teach the socioeconomically and educationally disadvantaged students in the inner cities of Pennsylvania.

In 1979, the University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff conducted a pilot program to develop and implement preservice and inservice teacher education programs to address the needs of special needs students in vocational programs. In order to attain their objectives, the project was divided into three stages: needs assessment, curriculum development, and field testing.

A number of projects have been completed that focus on the role of vocational special needs personnel. The primary goal of most of the studies is to aid personnel in acquiring the skills and leadership abilities essential for working with exceptional children at the secondary and postsecondary levels. The long-range goal is to prepare participants who will plan, design, develop, implement, and evaluate programs to expand the vocational training needs of the disadvantaged, handicapped, and persons of limited English-speaking ability (Bowen 1980).

The University of Idaho (Kaufman 1978) has developed and implemented an innovative program of vocational special needs teacher preparation that takes into account the state's low population density, extreme travel distances between population centers, hazardous climatic conditions, and a population and state tax structure that make staff expansion at the university economically unfeasible.

Current Issues and Trends

Some major influences on personnel development for special populations in vocational education over the past decade have included such issues and trends as mainstreaming, career education, and competency-based teacher education. Of these (and others not mentioned), competency-based teacher education (CBTE) has probably had a greater emphasis in the preparation of vocational education personnel than for any other educational discipline.

In a review of twelve vocational/special education competency studies Albright (1978) notes that nearly all utilize a role analysis procedure for determining teacher competencies.

Probably the most in-depth work on the development of competency/performance-based teacher education has been conducted by the National Center for Research in Vocational Education. Staff on the performance-based teacher education module series project at the National Center first became interested in the competencies needed by vocational educators in order to work with students with special needs during the development of the 100 PBTE modules based on the 584 competencies identified by Cotrell (1971). Late in the module development process, the staff realized that (1) some of the competencies were becoming outdated, (2) events over the past ten years had changed the role of the vocational teacher, and (3) at least two areas of competencies

were missing from the original list. The missing competencies were those dealing with serving students with special needs, and those dealing with the development and implementation of competency-based instructional programs at the secondary and postsecondary levels.

In 1979, as one of the studies designated by the U.S. Office of Education, the National Center initiated the Development of Performance-Based Teacher Education Modules to Impact on Training Vocational Educators in Nondiscriminatory Practices project. As part of this project, a complete literature search was conducted to identify prior related studies. The search was accomplished through computerized access to the Lockheed Information Syster , using the ERIC and Council for Exceptional Children databases, among others. A number of competency identification studies were located and reviewed. In addition, other projects were identified that included implied competencies within their findings.

Based upon these observations regarding the development of competency-based teacher preparation to prepare special needs vocational personnel, Hamilton and Harrington (1979) suggest a new approach that involves skills training for teachers that has applicability across special needs (and "normal") groups. By acquiring these skills—whether by modular instruction or by other delivery modes—the belief is that vocational education personnel can be assisted in serving all students individually and effectively.

The Influence of Key Leadership Groups

The U.S. Congress

In the development of policy statements for direction in vocational education personnel development, the U.S. Congress was clearly aware of the need for personnel development when the "original" federal vocational legislation, the Smith-Hughes Act (P.L. 64-347), permitted federal funds to focus on teacher education. Similarly, the second Morrill Act (enacted in 1890 and amended in 1907) emphasized the need to train teacher educators however, whether it was general education or vocational education, no significant legislative emphasis was given to the total personnel development needs until the p sage of the Education Professions Development Act (EPDA) in 1967. Only a small percent (estimated at 4.6) of the appropriated EPDA funds were used for vocational education.

Congress amended Title II of the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968 (P.L. 90-575) to EPDA as the Part F Amendments. The level of funding allocation from EPDA appropriations, nonetheless, was still very low. The U.S. Congress recognized this situation and mandated that at least 10 percent of all funds appropriated for EPDA be used for the purposes of EPDA, Part F. In the years to follow, no funds were requested administratively in the U.S. Office of Education's (now U.S. Department of Education) budgetary requests for Part F. Hence, the lack of (or at least the very little) support given by the U.S. Office of Education led to the diffusion of any well-developed personnel development policy at the federal level and to the subsequent demise of EPDA in 1978. However, credit must be given to the former Congress for having the vision to exercise responsible leadership for the improvement of this nation's vocational education professional and personnel development needs.

U.S. Department of Education

A basic problem cited by many (e.g., Clark and Evans 1976) regarding the leadership groups at the federal level is the pressure on them to address a myriad of priorities.

The Office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE), formerly Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education, does view programs for special populations and the need to train personnel to work with these persons as important. Most vocal on this issue is Dr. Muriel Shay Tapman, whom this writer interviewed in preparation for writing this report. Tapman stresses the need to assist vocational personnel in preparing all persons for the world of work. She stresses the important role the OVAE can play (as under the old Part F programs) in preparing vocational education personnel to acquire these necessary skills and competencies.

Under the EPDA, the U.S. Vocational Education Personnel Development Branch had as one priority the development of personnel development programs for special needs personnel. Drs. Tapman and Duane Nielsen, in particular, were instrumental in forging this policy direction. The U.S. Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services cites vocational programming, including preparation of personnel to teach handicapped students, as one its top funding priorities. The bottom line, however, appears to be that there is little or no coordination between and/or among the leadership groups within the U.S. Department of Education, nor is a real master plan for professional and personnel development evolving. Hopefully, the upcoming vocational education legislation will provide overall policy direction for the department in this regard.

State Departments of Education

The most positive and obvious trend has been the increase in the number of states requiring all teachers to take special education coursework to continue or obtain certification (twenty-two had this requirement in 1981). A few states (e.g., Nebraska and New Jersey) have adopted certification standards that require certain competencies for personnel who provide vocational programming for special needs learners. Iowa is one notable example of a state that has not only placed the program for special needs directly under the state commissioner of education and staffed it with vocational and special educators, but has also stressed the acquisition of multicultural education competencies for state certification. Thus, it appears that some states are taking leadership initiatives in imposing standards on vocational/special education personnel who will teach handicapped and minority students. Obviously, a leadership void still remains in certification standards.

Professional Organizations

Professional organizations are emerging as one of the nation's best advocates for vocational programming of special populations. Examples include the creation of a new division within the American Vocational Association (AVA) entitled Special Needs Division, and the National Association of Vocational Education Special Needs Personnel (NAVESNP), which has state-affiliated organizations in practically every state. An often heard criticism of these two organizations is that they tend to be greater advocates for handicapped persons than for disadvantaged persons of racial/ethnic identity. Upon viewing the activities and conference agenda for NAVESNP during the past five years, it is apparent that the criticism may be warranted. Yet, minority persons are visible at all levels of NAVESNP, and the potential influence of this group upon vocational education policy is encouraging.

A significant occurrence as a result of EPDA funding was the convening of a national workshop, on increasing the participation of black Americans in vocational education. This marked the first time in the nation's history that blacks, whites, and other racial/ethnic minorities came together at a meeting of this stature to discuss and plan strategies for increasing the participation of blacks in vocational education (Sheppard 1977). An outcome of this meeting was the founding of the National Association for the Advancement of Black Americans in Vocational Education (NAABAVE), a professional organization whose basic purpose is to address those problems and issues in the broad field of vocational and technical education that are idiosyncratic to the participation of blacks.

These organizations, as well as others, have enormous potential to foster professional and personnel preparation programs at the national and state level. A critical factor will be their recognition of the necessity for cooperative leadership and their decision of how that leadership is to be shared.

There have been definite trends of progress in training personnel who plan and implement vocational programs for special populations or minority and handicapped students. Perhaps because of the Education of All Handicapped Children Act (P.L. 94-142) or other reasons, the emphasis has been on more professional and personnel preparation programs or programmatic innovations aimed at education for the handicapped than for persons of racial/ethnic identity. Then, too, the handicapped have their own advocacy groups and a host of other legislative measures at both national and state levels. Comparable constituencies or advocacy groups for minority students are few and far between.

Overall, the performance of past federal and state policies (better stated as "no policies") has created a leadership void at all levels. Piecemeal, token efforts at programming in the important area of professional development and personnel preparation will probably continue unless the situation is reversed by federal policy for vocational education personnel development.

Significance of the Problem

The sporadic success of efforts to assimilate persons from special populations into vocational education vividly points to the need for and importance of continuous professional development across all levels of vocational education personnel: vocational teachers, administrators, state personnel, and teacher educators. The perceived training needs of these groups are reported in the literature (Feck 1972; Gruber 1981; Phelps and Thornton 1979; Sheppard 1975, 1983b; Shill 1976; Weatherman and Krantz 1975). What is needed is a clearly defined federal vocational education policy authorizing funds for staff development, in general, as well as programs to prepare vocational personnel to teach students of special populations in particuar.

Rapid social and technological changes are increasing the demands for teachers to acquire new competencies in order to implement educational reform. It is no longer assumed that teachers can acquire all the skills they will need in their professional career solely from an undergraduate or graduate training program. Coordinated and continuous staff development activities are necessary at the preservice and inservice levels.

Expectations for staff development are especially high in the area of vocational education for special populations. Vocational educators find it necessary to upgrade their expertise continuously in order to stay current with the new and emerging developments in their occupational fields. At the same time, they are asked to increase their capacity to teach these occupational skills to a

wider range of clientele, including the handicapped, the disadvantaged, limited English speaking persons, displaced homemakers, and high-risk youths, to name a few. High priority is also given to the educational needs of males and females in nontraditional occupations.

It is imperative that personnel development programs be expanded in order to respond to these demanding challenges and responsibilities. It is crucial that federal policy be initiated by the U.S. Department of Education to support personnel development for the preparation of vocational education personnel to work with special populations.

CHAPTER 2

THE POLICY PROBLEM

Problem Statement, Assumptions, Definitions, and Client Identification

Problem Statement

The National Commission on Excellence in Education (1983) report, *A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Education Reform*, indicates that teacher preparation programs need substantial improvement and that severe shortages of certain kinds of teachers exist (including specialists in education for gifted and talented, language minority, and handicapped students).

This situation is certainly applicable to the broad field of vocational and technical education, namely, *too few fully trained vocational education personnel are available to teach persons from special populations*. Vocational teacher educators need to learn how to teach teachers to work with special needs students; vocational teachers need to develop greater skills and competencies in teaching special populations; and vocational administrators need to learn how to administer programs designed for students of special populations more effectively.

In addition to the need to upgrade existing vocational education staff, there also is a major problem in recruiting and developing new fulltime staff members, especially to teach special needs students. For example, there are very few vocational staff members from minority groups. It is well known that Hispanic (and other minority) vocational staff who are well qualified serve as important role models for students of their ethnic group. Unfortunately, black and other minority counselors, administrators, and teacher educators are few and far between in vocational education.

In summary, the problem addressed by this policy analysis paper is *the lack of highly qualified vocational education personnel available for states to fulfill their commitment to and meet the intent of the law mandating effective vocational programs for special populations*.

Assumptions

Prior to the development of any policy, the assumptions upon which it is based must be delineated as precisely as possible. Research related to vocational education personnel development for special populations has been sparse (though a body of literature is being developed). Therefore, these assumptions result from an analysis of past experience and are based on the judgments rendered by recognized experts in the areas that comprise vocational education. The following assumptions have been identified:

- Continued focus will be on serving special populations groups, as will be evidenced in the "new" vocational education bill.

- Vocational education is as desirable a choice or option for members of handicapped categories or racial/ethnic minorities to have as it is for other members of society in the pursuit of a career or life goal.

- Competent, experienced, well-trained personnel will result in more effective programs for handicapped and minority students.

- Vocational education enrollments will increase by a higher percentage of handicapped and minority students enrollments at both the secondary and postsecondary/adult levels.

- Institutions of higher education must be responsible for the quality of the education graduates they produce and accountable for those graduates' failure to respond with compassion and competency to the needs of special needs personnel development.

- There will be a continuing, more intensive federal-state partnership in responsibility for and leadership in vocational education special needs personnel development.

Major Definitions

Terms should be defined if a policy is to be understood. The following terms are germane to this policy analysis effort:

- **Special populations.** In general, this group refers to persons who have educational, social, and physical barriers (as well as being economically deprived) who require special attention in educational environments to enable them to succeed. The specific reference is to persons discriminated against on the basis of racial/ethnic identity and/or handicap.

- **Personnel development.** Generally, personnel development is either preservice or inservice in nature. *Preservice* personnel development is provided to an individual prior to a contract or an employment agreement. *Inservice* personnel development is provided for an individual after a contract or an employment agreement is made.

Issues

As a preliminary activity to developing this policy paper, a number of questions/issues were considered. The following are based on a review of the literature, as well as input from teachers, teacher educators, and vocational education personnel in the U.S. Department of Education.

- Should certification in special needs be required for all vocational education personnel to work with special populations?

  1. What competencies will constitute the curriculum to prepare vocational education personnel to teach handicapped and minority students?

  2. Should this kind of change be encouraged and continued?

- How can institutional capability and capacity to produce the quantity and quality of personnel needed be determined?

- How can we encourage a greater degree of cooperation and communication among and within state agencies, institutions of higher education, local schools, and the U.S. Department of Education?

    1. What is the role of the federal personnel development and special needs units in this process?

    2. What is the role of the state coordinator of personnel development in this process?

    3. What is the role of the state supervisor of special needs in this process?

    4. What is the responsibility for achieving this goal at institutional and local levels?

- How can we expand and diversify the population groups (e.g., minority, handicapped, disadvantaged, etc.) from which potential vocational educators are selected?

- How can we become more certain that vocational education special needs personnel development is systematic and cost-effective in meeting the need for professional growth and development of all present and future personnel for special populations?

There are undoubtedly many more relevant issues that could be identified, and without a doubt there is some lack of specificity and definition of the five listed here. Because of the resource and time constraint, no attempt was made to answer or respond to these concerns in the context of this report; however, these issues do serve as a framework for a greater appreciation of the challenge in performing the intended policy analysis and implementing the recommended policy alternatives.

System Context and Specification

Although the U.S. Department of Education is the primary stakeholder, other agencies, groups, and persons are significantly affected by the formulation and implementation of policies on personnel preparation for special populations. These include the U.S. Congress and state legislatures, teacher education institutions, state departments of education, professional organizations, and lastly, the special groups who stand to benefit from these policy initiatives. To a large degree, these groups share an interdependence regarding the problem and will all, to some extent, be affected by the recommendations that will be made.

Approach to Policy Analysis

Major data and information sources used in developing this policy analysis include the following:

- An orientation conference (directed by William Dunn, Policy Analysis, University of Pittsburg) at the National Center for Research in Vocational Education

- An informal network of vocational educators, special educators, personnel development specialists, leaders from handicapped organizations, and minority educators

- Computerized searchers of ERIC, Projects in Progress, and other data sources.

- Congressional hearing reports, journal articles, recent policy position statements by national organizations, recent annual reports to Congress from the U.S. Department of Education, and data from the Vocational Education Data System (VEDS)

- Interviews of key vocational education, special education, and special needs vocational education personnel in the U.S. Department of Education, state-department-level vocational education personnel, and leaders of professional organizations in vocational education

Information was also obtained via the telephone from many individuals representing various professional organizations, private and state agencies, and special groups who expressed grave concern that the federal government (and the U.S. Department of Education, in particular) does not regard personnel development in vocational education as a high priority for needed policy initiatives.

CHAPTER 3

POLICY ALTERNATIVES

Description of Alternatives

Based on the literature review, expert opinions, and the author's experience, the following alternative solutions are proposed to the problem of too few qualified vocational education personnel who are involved in the delivery of vocational education to special populations at the secondary, postsecondary, and adult levels.

No. 1. The content of preservice and inservice programs for professional development and personnel preparation should be based on validated methods, techniques, and curricula.

No. 2. The U.S. Department of Education should require that each state develop a personnel development program with emphasis on special populations personnel preparation.

No. 3. A competency-based approach should be emphasized in the preservice and inservice preparation of vocational education personnel to teach special populations.

No. 4. Vocational education personnel should be certified to work with special populations.

No. 5. Greater emphasis should be placed on recruiting vocational education personnel from the ranks of those special populations to be served.

No. 6. Results of inservice activity focused on special populations should be infused into preservice training.

No. 7. The U.S. Department of Education should set aside a fixed percentage of personnel development funds for special needs personnel development.

No. 8. Preservice programs should be redesigned by teacher education institutions to facilitate early involvement of prospective vocational education personnel with minority and/or culturally different persons.

No. 9. The Congress/U.S. Department of Education should reestablish Section 553 (part F of the old EDPA) and to make grants through state agencies to provide opportunities to update vocational education personnel competencies by putting emphasis on special populations through exchange programs with business and industry or other means, and to provide other inservice teacher education and short-term industries.

No. 10. The Congress/U.S. Department of Education should reestablish the Leadership Development Program (Section 552, Part F of EPDA) to train administrators and other instructional leaders and to retrain personnel from other fields to work with special populations in vocational education.

Table 4 compares the recommended policy alternatives or actions to be taken to alleviate the shortage of vocational education personnel to teach, plan, and administer vocational education programs for special populations. It uses specific criteria (i.e., political feasibility, effectiveness, efficiency, equity, responsiveness, and appropriateness) to determine the best alternative. An analysis of the alternatives, based on the assignment of weights given (plus sign = strength; minus sign = weakness; question mark = some concern; etc.), lead to the policy alternatives to be recommended for implementation.

The following sections discuss the strengths/weaknesses or advantages/disadvantages of each policy alternative.

ALTERNATIVE NO. 1

The content of preservice and inservice programs for professional development and personnel preparation should be based on validated methods, techniques, and curricula.

Advantages

This policy alternative seems to be appropriate, politically feasible, and relevant to training vocational education personnel to work with special populations. The dissemination of validated practices would be more effective if linked with other major pieces of legislation for special populations (e.g., P.L. 94-142, JPTA, Titles IX and VII).

The target audiences for personnel preparation/professional development would include state department personnel, guidance counselors, special educators, and other service providers, as well as vocational educators. The value of this policy alternative is its potential impact upon preservice and inservice training for vocational educators.

Disadvantages

No negative issues are discernable; however, the inclusion of such validated practices would not guarantee an increase in the number of qualified vocational education personnel to teach handicapped and minority students.

ALTERNATIVE NO. 2

The U.S. Department of Education should require that each state develop a personnel development program with emphasis on special populations personnel preparation.

Advantages

This policy alternative overwhelmingly would meet the criteria and could offer the greatest hope for resolving the problem of too few competent vocational education personnel to serve students from special populations in vocational education. The relevance, timeliness, and intended use of this policy alternative would be viewed as an advantage in the light of the impending "new" vocational education bill. The potential impact of this alternative on the U.S. Department of Education should also be noteworthy.

TABLE 4

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN POLICY ALTERNATIVES AND CRITERIA FOR SELECTION

POLICY ALTERNATIVES	CRITERIA[a]					
	Political feasibility	Effectiveness	Equity	Efficiency	Responsiveness	Appropriateness
1. The content of preservice and inservice programs for professional development and personnel preparation should be based on validation methods, techniques, and curricula.	+		+	+	+	+
2. The U.S. Department of Education should require that each state develop a personnel development program with emphasis on special population personnel preparation.	?	+	+	+	+	+
3. A competency-based approach should be emphasized in the preservice and inservice preparation of vocational education personnel to teach special populations.	+	+	?	+	+	+
4. Vocational education personnel should be certified to work with special populations.	?	+		?	+	?
5. Greater emphasis should be placed on recruiting vocational education personnel from the ranks of those special populations to be served.	+	?	+	+	+	+
6. Results of inservice activity focused on special populations should be infused into preservice training.	+	?	+	+	?	?
7. The U.S. Department of Education should set aside a fixed percentage of personnel development funds for special needs personnel develment.	?	+	+	?	+	+
8. Preservice programs should be redesigned by teacher education institutions to facilitate early involvement of prospective vocational education personnel with minority and/or culturally different persons.	+	?	+	+	+	

TABLE 4 (continued)

POLICY ALTERNATIVES	CRITERIA*					
	Political feasibility	Effectiveness	Equity	Efficiency	Responsiveness	Appropriateness
9. The Congress/U.S. Department of Education should reestablish Section 553 (Part F of the old EPDA) and make grants through state agencies to provide opportunities to update vocational education personnel competencies by putting emphasis on special populations through exchange programs with business and industry or other means, and to provide other inservice teacher education and short-term institutes.	?	+	+	?	+	+
10. The Congress/U.S. Department of Education should reestablish the Leadership Development Program (Section 552, Part F of EPDA) to train administrators and other instructional leaders and to retrain personnel from other fields to work with special populations in vocational education.		?		+		+

Legend: In this table, a minus sign indicates a definite weakness; a plus sign indicates strength or positive support of the policy alternative; a question mark denotes a source of concern; and a blank space indicates criteria that are difficult to analyze in relation to the policy alternative.

* **Definition of criteria** (as operationally used in this report):

Political feasibility: the probable support, relevance, and influence of key stakeholders in gaining acceptance for implementing each alternative
Effectiveness: which policy alternative would do the best job of training vocational personnel to work with special populations
Equity: The extent to which economic and social benefits would be distributed to the different stakeholders or targeted groups
Efficiency: the marginal costs of different kinds of training options or programs
Responsiveness: the probable reactions of vocational personnel to being trained, and those of professional organizations, teacher education institutions, and others to the need for the policy
Appropriateness: poses the question, "Is the policy alternative suitable, based on stated goals and objectives?"

Disadvantages

There would be the possibility of strong lobbying against such an alternative by the various states because of cut-backs in other areas of the vocational education dollar. The potential lack of support by the Reagan Administration and monitoring for policy compliance also should be causes for concern.

ALTERNATIVE NO. 3

A competency-based approach should be emphasized in the preservice and inservice preparation of vocational education personnel to teach special populations.

Advantages

The competency approach, given the improvement (most notably the work of the National Center on Research in Vocational Education and numerous funded studies supported by the U.S. Department of Education and state departments) in identifying and validating those competencies/tasks unique to specific special needs groups, would make this an attractive policy alternative to the problem of vocational education personnel with lack of skill and experience in serving students from special populations. This policy alternative should facilitate efforts to improve the preparation of vocational education personnel to work with students from special populations.

advantages

Many competencies identified and/or studied in the research literature have lacked specificity and have failed to cover skills applicable across special populations (and "normal") groups. Hence, there should be concern as to whether the development of training modules predicated on the competency-based approach would be likely to increase the cadre of well trained vocational educators to work with students from special populations.

ALTERNATIVE NO. 4

Vocational education personnel should be ceritified to work with special populations.

Advantages

Although political feasibility and appropriateness could possibly be sources of concern in some states, it should be encouraging to note that many states now require not only vocational education personnel, but also all educational personnel, to become certified to teach, design, or administer programs for special needs students. This policy alternative would have the potential to be an effective strategy in "weeding out" the incompetent personnel and, hopefully, in bringing in the competent ones. Finally, this policy alternative should have significant effects upon not only certification, but also on licensure and curriculum reforms, as well.

Disadvantages

Change-resistant certification boards in some states and the "political realities" of budgeting to train or retrain state department and university vocational education personnel would likely raise serious concerns about certification requirements.

ALTERNATIVE NO. 5

Greater emphasis should be placed on recruiting vocational education personnel from the ranks of those special populations to be served.

Advantages

This policy alternative should facilitate efforts to increase the numbers of Blacks, American Indians, Hispanics, Asian Americans, handicapped persons, and other persons from special populations to become vocational educators. Because role identification is so important to minority youths and handicapped persons, recruitment from the surrounding community would be especially desirable for vocational education personnel.

Disadvantages

Ill-conceived, inadequate, and careless planning of a recruitment program could result in "turning off" these prospective recruits as vocational educators; hence, a carefully conceived recruitment strategy would be imperative. Overall, if properly executed, this policy alternative should result in positive outcomes.

ALTERNATIVE NO. 6

Results of inservice activity focused on special populations should be infused into preservice training.

Advantages

Based upon the political feasibility, equity, and efficiency criteria, this policy alternative would offer some potential resolution to the problem. The primary reason for this optimism has been based on the considerable number of projects, activities, and products funded by states and the federal government since passage of the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968.

Disadvantages

While this policy option would have merit, the concern regarding the criteria of effectiveness, responsiveness, and appropriateness would make this a questionable policy alternative to alleviate the problem.

ALTERNATIVE NO. 7

The U.S. Department of Education should set aside a fixed percentage of personnel development funds (35 percent) for special needs personnel development.

Advantages

This policy alternative would call for the federal government to make a commitment to special needs personnel development via the allocation of monies for that purpose. Although, it would be difficult to reasonably expect a high degree of political support by the Reagan Administration for this alternative, the effectiveness, equity responsiveness, and appropriateness criteria would make this a viable policy alternative to strengthen vocational education personnel preparation, in general, and special needs personnel preparation, in particular. (Note: The suggested 35 percent of funds has been based upon the percentage of enrollment of students in all special population categories in vocational education programs.)

Disadvantages

The major concerns would be the cost (in dollars) in relation to the other options in supporting vocational education personnel development, as well as, the unenviable task of convincing an administration committed to trimming the educational dollar.

ALTERNATIVE NO. 8

Preservice programs should be redesigned by teacher education institutions to facilitate early involvement of prospective vocational education personnel with minority and/or culturally different persons.

Advantages

The vocational preparation program at the preservice level should provide stimulating, meaningful offerings, starting at the time students enter the program and continuing through the duration of their teaching careers. The extent to which the design of these experiences during the preservice years would bring students into direct contact with handicapped, minority, disadvantaged, and other special populations could increase the potential positive impact of prospective vocational educators on the lives of these "special students."

Disadavantages

Policy compliance monitoring of this policy alternative could be a major difficulty. However, the requirement that vocational teacher education institutions of higher education have approved comprehensive plans of personnel development as a contingency for reimbursed positions should lessen any substantive monitoring difficulties.

ALTERNATIVE NO. 9

The Congress/U.S. Department of Education should reestablish Section 553 (Part F of the old EDPA) and make grants through state agencies to provide opportunities to update vocational education personnel competencies by putting emphasis on special populations through exchange programs with business and industry or other means, and to provide other inservice teachers education and short-term institutes.

Advantages

The primary reason for recommending this policy alternative has been based on the enormous track record of Section 553, Part F, of the Education Professions Development ACT (EPDA) in the personnel preparation/professional development of vocational educators. In making grants on a competitive basis to state agencies (as under old Section 553) emphasis would be placed on the development of statewide master plans for professional development in vocational education. Priority would be given to proposals designed to (1) equalize educational opportunities, (2) address the special populations problems, (3) identify and try out new approaches to inservice training (especially industry-school exchange programs), and (4) provide on-site experience for teachers and others. On-site projects would usually be those carried on with local educational agencies, perhaps in cooperation with teacher training institutions, Indian reservations, vocational rehabilitation centers, and other such entities.

This policy alternative could provide the U.S. Department of Education with a viable, well-developed federal policy on vocational education personnel development.

Disadvantages

Potential drawbacks and/or concerns regarding this alternative would be its political feasibility (possible splintering of stakeholders) and efficiency (cost).

ALTERNATIVE NO. 10

The Congress/U.S. Department of Education should reestablish the leadership Development Program (Section 552, Part F of EPDA) to train administrators and other instructional leaders and to retrain personnel from other fields to work with special populations in vocational education.

Advantages

The purpose of Section 552, Part F, of the old EPDA was to make leadership awards available and to provide opportunities to educators to spend full time in advanced study of vocational education for a period not to exceed three years in length. This policy alternative, offered as a revision of the old EPDA (Part F, Section 552) and of the Vocational Education Act (Section 172), as amended by the Education Amendments of 1976, would provide the opportunity to maintain a well-trained cadre of vocational education personnel and training facilities (institutions). The potential impact that this policy alternative could have upon vocational education, vocational education personnel development, and the participating institutions would be enormous. The proposed policy alternative would set up regional institutions of higher education nationwide to provide training for serving minority, handicapped, bilingual, and disadvantaged students at the

secondary, postsecondary, and adult levels. Approximately 25 percent of the 35 percent set-aside funds previously recommended for special needs personnel development would be utilized for this regional concept.

Disadvantages

Political feasibility, efficiency (cost), appropriateness, and the question of whether this approach would do the most effective job of training vocational education personnel to work with special populations appear to be some of the primary concerns in putting this policy alternative into operation. From all indications (e.g., Congressional testimony, personal interviews, U.S. Department of Education reports, and so forth) regarding the cost for the former EPDA (Section 552) and the Vocational Education Act (Section 172), the presence of these programs on the campuses of participating universities have had a significant impact on the comprehensiveness and the quality of their vocational teacher education programs. This success could be achieved again.

CHAPTER 4

POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

After careful analysis of the advantages and disadvantages for each policy alternative, the alternatives are presented according to which alternatives would be most effective in improving professional development and personnel preparation of vocational educators dealing with special populations.

The alternatives are divided into three categories, relative to their effectiveness in improving personnel preparation to teach students from special populations: most effective, moderately effective, and minimally effective.

Most Effective Alternatives

- The U.S. Department of Education should mandate or require statewide comprehensive programs of personnel development, including a system for preservice, graduate, and inservice activities; and attention should be given to the developmental needs of teachers, administrators and specialists, especially as their need for training relates to their competency in working with minority and handicapped students.

- A fixed percentage of each state's basic grant should be designated for professional development and personnel preparation. Provision should be made for a fixed percentage of any funds to be set aside for improvement of personnel preparation for special populations.

- The Congress/U.S. Department of Education should reestablish Section 553 (Part F of the old EPDA) and make grants through state agencies to provide opportunities to update vocational education personnel competencies by putting the emphasis on special populations through exchange programs with business and industry or other means, and to provide other inservice teacher education and short-term institutes.

- The Congress/U.S. Department of Education should reestablish the Leadership Development Program (Section 552, Part F of EPDA) to train administrators and other instructional leaders and to retrain personnel from other fields to work with special populations in vocational education.

Moderately Effective Alternatives

- The content of preservice and inservice programs for professional development and personnel preparation should be based on validated methods, techniques, and curricula.

- Certification should be required for preparation of those who teach, counsel, or administer the education of special populations. There is an increasing number of states offering certification for personnel who provide vocational education and training for secondary, postsecondary, and adult-level minority and handicapped students.

- New approaches to staff recruitment should be utilized in recruiting vocational education personnel (e.g., greater emphasis should be placed on recruiting personnel from special populations). Increased numbers of Blacks, Mexican Americans, American Indians, Asian Americans, and handicapped persons should be encouraged to become teachers, administrators, and specialists in vocational education. Because role identification is so important to minority youths and adults, recruitment from the community would be especially desirable for vocational teachers.

Minimally Effective Alternatives

- Competency-based approaches to preservice and inservice should be utilized in professional development and personnel preparation for teaching special populations. A number of efforts have been made to identify systematically those competencies needed by teachers of handicapped and minority youths/adults and then to relate those competencies to some model for preparing personnel specifically for those roles. Competency-based approaches should capitalize on these findings.

- Results of inservice activity focused on special populations should be infused into preservice training.

- Early involvement with minority and handicapped youths should be an important element of vocational education personnel preparation.

Implementation Strategy

This policy analysis of the need for vocational education personnel preparation to serve special populations should be considered by the U.S. Department of Education, state departments of education, and teacher education institutions in determining appropriate policy directions. Secondary roles can be performed by other leadership groups (e.g., professional organizations and advocacy groups such as NAVESNP, AVEPDA, NAABAVE). Implementation of a policy alternative should be included in the forthcoming vocational education legislation. Funding should support a national conference to encourage dialogue among U.S. Department of Education officials, state department leaders, those from professional organzations, and other relevant stakeholders, including representation from the special groups identified in this report.

What should the federal role ultimately be? First, and at the very least, federal policy should recognize vocational education personnel development as separate from program improvement and support services, even though this is a support service, and it should set aside a fixed amount of money for funds to support both general personnel preparation and special needs professional development/personnel preparation in vocational education.

Second, the federal government should develop a comprehensive plan for vocational education personnel development for inclusion in the regulations of the impending legislation. An identifiable staff in the U.S. Office of Vocational and Adult Education should be held accountable for

implementing the plan. The federal government should then mandate that state use of federal vocational education funds for program improvement be contingent upon compliance with the regulations in the comprehensive personnel development plan.

Third, the federal government should offer to states and institutions of higher education the technical assistance necessary to analyze personnel development needs on a statewide, regional, or local level. Such assistance should include help in developing personnel preparation strategies appropriate to special populations in vocational education.

Fourth, the federal government should mandate a fixed percentage of personnel development funds to be set aside in each state for special needs personnel development.

Fifth, the federal government should require that funding in the basic state grant be used to facilitate the preservice, graduate, and inservice training of vocational education personnel in working with students from special populations.

Sixth, in addition to personnel identified as being eligible for vocational education personnel development in Title I, Section 135 of P.L. 94-482 (e.g., vocational administrators, teachers, and teacher trainers), the federal government should also include business and industry personnel, teacher aides, and volunteers. This strategy would increase the probability that persons qualified and experienced in working with minority and handicapped students would be located and recruited for vocational education.

Finally, the federal government should strengthen vocational education personnel preparation by establishing clear expectations that states must view vocational education personnel preparation to special populations as a priority. This should be evidenced by regulations, edicts, and mandates if states are to obtain funding. It should reward states which demonstrate measurable progress toward this goal, especially where there is documented evidence that disabled, limited-English-speaking or ethnic minorities and disadvantaged groups have been targeted for hiring in vocational education and that programs of recruitment have been successful.

Provisions for Monitoring and Evaluation

It is recommended that a separate and independent advisory body—consisting of personnel development specialists, supervisors of special needs programs, teacher educators, professional organization leaders, business and industry personnel, and persons from all levels of vocational education (local, state, and federal), as well as persons from special populations—engage in process and outcome evaluation of the policy's effectiveness at quarterly intervals. Results of monitoring and evaluation should be stored in the Vocational Education Data System (VEDS).

An estimate of the cost for such a system is difficult to make; however, the cost for developing and maintaining a viable advisory group should be a cost-efficient operation. Current advisory bodies with oversight responsibilities at the federal level could be used as suitable models (e.g., National Advisory Council on Vocational Education and state advisory councils on vocational education). This independent advisory body could assist in the assessment of all vocational personnel development needs in the nation. Similarly, at the state level it could sample the adequacy of available data and critique all state plans for personnel development.

Supplementary Suggestions

The following suggestions are offered to the U.S. Department of Education and are based on input from professionals in the field, professional organizations, leaders representing special populations, and from Congressional testimony:

- Attention should be given to improving the delivery of vocational education personnel development in the colleges and universities committed to vocational education. Faculty development plans are needed to update skills and knowledge, and perhaps support should be included for faculty sabbatical leaves.

- Periodically survey and publicize state and local staff development activities that have proven to be successful, especially those effort/techniques proven to be effective with special populations.

- Vocational education personnel development for special populations should be an integral part of other program improvement components (e.g., research, curriculum development, demonstration, etc.).

- Because of the vocational education personnel shortage, especially in the areas of special populations, provide support for, increase training, and increase use of paraprofessional/support personnel and consider the recruitment of minority, handicapped, retired, or other special populations with occupational experience for roles as paraprofessionals in providing vocational education to special needs groups.

CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The goal of this policy analysis document is to offer recommendations, by presenting and discussing alternative policies, that may lead to the improvement of professional development and personnel preparation of vocational educators to work with special populations.

The assessment of past policy performance and efforts toward vocational education personnel preparation revealed the existence of an increasing number of advocates from vocational education, special education, professional organizations, minority groups, the handicapped, federal and state legislators, and other relevant stakeholders who realize the enormity of the task and the urgency of having a sound, coordinated, comprehensive, and broad policy that is appropriate, cost-effective, and efficient for professional development and personnel preparation in vocational education.

Some very real limitations of the policy recommendations are that (1) sufficient funds will not be targeted for personnel development in the forthcoming vocational education legislation, (2) fixed percentages or set asides for personnel preparation will not be included activities, and (3) strong mandates requiring states to develop and maintain comprehensive programs of personnel development (as under the old Part F, EPDA) will not be part of the legislation.

The policy alternatives are, of course, easier to recommend than to implement and regulate. They represent critical considerations for action that the U.S. Department of Education (the primary stakeholder) and others (e.g., state departments, teacher education institutions, advocacy groups and the like) should carefully review and weigh as potential resolutions to the problem of too few well-qualified vocational education personnel available to teach, plan, develop, and administer programs for special populations. It is hoped that these policy considerations will provide some clarity in devising policy to remedy a longstanding problem.

REFERENCES

Albright, L., and Markel, G. *Vocational Education for the Handicapped: Perspectives on Program Evaluation*. Personnel Development Series, Document 4. Urbana: University of Illinois, Vocational and Special Education, May 1982. (ED 211 720)

Albright L. "Review of Research on Competency Identification in Special Needs Personnel Development Programs." *Journal of Vocational Education Research* 3, no. 4 (Fall 1978): 13-30.

American Vocational Association. *A National Agenda for Vocational Education*. Arlington, VA: AVA, 1981.

Benson, Elaine. *Vocational Education for the Handicapped: Perspectives on Certification*. Personnel Development Series, Document 3. Urbana: University of Illinois, Leadership Training Institute, May 1982. (ED 224 952)

Bowen, E. M. "An Analysis of the Teacher Education Needs of Vocational/Special Education Educational Personnel." *Action in Teacher Education* 2, no. 3 (Summer 1980): 49-53.

Brock, R. J. *Preparing Vocational and Special Education Personnel to Work with Special Needs Students—State of the Art 1977*. Menomonie: University of Wisconsin-Stout, 1977.

Brock, R. J. *Preparing Vocational and Special Education Personnel to Work with Special Needs Students—State of the Art 1977-79*. Menomonie: University of Wisconsin-Stout, 1979.

Clark, G. M., and Evans, R. N. "The State of the Art." In *Issues in the Preparation of Personnel for the Vocational Programming of Special Needs Students: Synopses of Selected Materials*, edited by E. K. Abbas and P. L. Sitlington. Springfield: Illinois State Office of Education, January 1976. (ED 118 828)

Conaway, C. A. "Vocational Education Serves the Handicapped." *Vocational Education Journal* 56, no. 3 (April 1981): 24.

Cotrel, Calvin J.; Bennett, James G.; Cameron, Walter J.; Chase, Shirley A.; Molnar, Marilyn J.; and Wilson, Roger J. *Model Curricula for Vocational and Technical Teacher Education: Report No. 1. Performance Requirements for Teachers. Final Report*. Columbus: National Center for Research in Vocational Education, The Ohio State University, 1971.

Evans, R. N. *Speech on Vocational Education Reauthorization and Vocational Education*. Urbana: University of Illinois, 2 December 1980.

Feck, V. J. *A Review and Survey of Literature, Research, and Programs Pertaining to Teaching Disadvantaged and Handicapped. Project Report*. Frankfort, KY: Bureau of Vocational Education, June 1972.

General Accounting Office. *What Is the Role of Federal Assistance for Vocational Education?* Comptroller General Report to the Congress: MWD-75-31, 31 December 1974. Washington, DC: GAO, 1974.

General Accounting Office. *Training Educators for the Handicapped: Need to Redirect Federal Programs*. Comptroller General Report to the Congress: HRD-76-77, 28 September 1976. Washington, DC: GAO, 1976.

Grosenick, J. K., and Huntze, S. L. *National Needs Analysis in Behavior Disorders: Severe Behavior Disorders*. Columbia: University of Missouri, 1980.

Gruber, S. E., et al. "Career/Vocational Education in the Individual Education Teacher Preparation and Application Strategies." Paper presented at the Council for Exceptional Children's Conference on the Exceptional Black/Bilingual Child, New Orleans, LA, February 1981. (ED 204 866)

Hamilton, J. B., and Harrington, L. C. "Review and Synthesis of Teacher Competencies to Serve Special Needs Students." Paper presented at the joint session of AVERA, AVEPDA, and Special Needs Section, American Vocational Association Convention, Anaheim, CA, 4 December 1979.

Hull, M. E. *Equity and Vocational Education: From the Special Educator's Perspective*. Columbus: The National Center for Research in Vocational Education, The Ohio State University, 1981.

Kauffman, J. J. *Development and Implementation of an Innovative Program of Vocational Special Needs Teacher Preparation*. Moscow: University of Idaho, College of Education, 1978. (ED 166 551)

Kienast, K. E., and Lovelace, B. E. *Vocational Education Personnel Development Needs for Working with the Handicapped*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Vocational and Adult Education, September 1981.

Ley, C. J. "The Relationship between Attitudes of Home Economics Educators toward the Mentally Retarded and Their Perception of Selected Teacher Characteristics." Unpublished master's thesis, Pennsylvania State University, 1975.

Meers, G. D. *Development and Implementation of Program Models for Assisting Vocational Teachers in Dealing with the Educationally Disadvantaged, Handicapped, and Minorities. Final Report*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska, 1977. (ED 145 173)

Moody, F., and Sheppard, N. A. "The Status of Blacks in Vocational Education: A Contemporary and Historical Perspective." In *The 1976 American Vocational Association Yearbook*, edited by James Wall. Washington, DC: American Vocational Association, 1976.

National Commission on Excellence in Education. *A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1983.

Phelps, L. A., and Clark, G. M. "Personnel Preparation for Vocational Programming of Special Needs Students." *Journal of Career Education* 3, no. 3 (1977): 35-51.

Phelps, L. A., and Thornton, L. J. *Vocational Education and Handicapped Learners: Perceptions and Inservice Needs of State Leadership Personnel*. Urbana-Champaign: University of Illinois, Department of Vocational and Technical Education, December 1979.

Proctor, Samuel D. *Equity from a Racial/Ethnic Perspective*. Columbus: National Center for Research in Vocational Education, The Ohio State University, 1981.

Sheppard, N. A. *Identification of Problems and Competencies Needed by Vocational and Technical Personnel Teaching Persons with Special Needs in Virginia*. Blacksburg: Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Division of Vocational Education, 1975. (ED 112 094)

Sheppard, N. A., and Sherrard, F., eds. *Proceedings of a National Conference on Increasing the Participation of Black Americans in Vocational and Technical Education*. Blacksburg: Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University College of Education, 1977. (ED 142 799)

Sheppard, N. A. "Cultural Factors Affecting the Participation of Blacks in Vocational Education." Paper presented at the American Education Research Association Convention, Montreal, Canada, 11-15 April 1983a.

Sheppard, N. A. "Competencies Needed and Inservice Problems of Vocational Teachers Teaching Disadvantaged Students in Self-Contained Classes." Paper presented at the American Education Research Association Convention, Montreal, Canada, 11-15 April 1983b.

Shill, J. F. *Developing Vocational Education Personnel to Meet the Needs of Persons in Special Groups*. Washington, DC: The American Vocational Association, 1976.

Snell, M. E.; Thompson, M.S.; and Taylor, K. G. "Providing Inservice to Educators of the Severely Handicapped: The Active Response Inservice Training Model." *Education and Training of the Mentally Retarded* 14 (1979): 25-33.

Stainbeck S.; Stainbeck, W.; and Maurer, S. "Training Teachers for the Severely and Profoundly Handicapped: A New Frontier." *Exceptional Children* 42 (1976): 203-210.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. *Money Income of Families and Persons in the United States*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Commerce, 1978.

Van Etten, G.; Arkell, C,; and Van Etten, C. *The Severely and Profoundly Handicapped: Programs, Methods and Materials*. St. Louis: The C. V. Mosby Co., 1980.

Vetter, L., et al. *Equity and Vocational Education: An Initial Synthesis of Progress and Recommendations for the Future*. Columbus: National Center for Research in Vocational Education, The Ohio State University, 1982.

Weatherman, R., and Krantz, G. *National Survey of State Special Needs Personnel Serving Handicapped and Disadvantaged Students in Vocational Education*. St. Paul: Department of Educational Administration, University of Minnesota, May 1975.

Yung, K.; Jennings, J.; and Haynie R. "Assessment of Needed Competencies of Vocational Teachers of Special Needs Students in the State of Arkansas." *The Journal of Vocational Special Needs Education* 1, no. 2 (January 1979).